

Universal Procedure for Enforcing Quantum Constraints

John R. Klauder

Departments of Physics and Mathematics

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611

Abstract

An abstract formulation of quantum dynamics in the presence of a general set of quantum constraints is developed. Our constructive procedure is such that the relevant projection operator onto the physical Hilbert space is obtained with a single, common integration procedure over the original Lagrange multiplier variables that is completely independent of the general nature of the constraints. In the associated lattice-limit formulation it is demonstrated that expansion of the constraint operator contribution to second order in the lattice spacing is necessary while, as usual, only a first-order expansion is needed for the dynamical operator contribution. Among various possibilities, coherent state path integrals are used to illustrate a completely functional representation of the abstract quantization procedure.

1 Introduction

The abstract operator formulation of quantum mechanics is generally recognized as being the most fundamental, while those formulations that involve one or another representation need to contend with representation-dependent issues (e.g., lack of global coordinates) that have no place in the essential formulation. Our goal here is to study quantum dynamics and quantum constraints as much as possible in an abstract, representation-independent way.

Only then should one feel comfortable about introducing a representation for further analysis. Let us start with some basics.

The evolution operator, from time $t = 0$ to time $t = T > 0$, for a general quantum system with an abstract, self-adjoint, time-independent Hamiltonian operator $\mathcal{H}$, is given, in units where $\hbar = 1$ (which are often used), by the unitary operator $e^{-i\mathcal{H}T}$ acting on an abstract Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ known henceforth as the “original” Hilbert space. If the Hamiltonian is time dependent and self adjoint for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$, the evolution operator is instead given by the unitary operator

$$\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T \mathcal{H}(t) dt} ,$$

where $\mathbf{T}$ denotes the time-ordering operator. We may append to $\mathcal{H}(t)$ a sum of additional, time-independent, self-adjoint operators $\{\Phi_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ with general, real-valued, time-dependent coefficients $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ leading, by assumption, for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$, to the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{H}(t) + \lambda^\alpha(t)\Phi_\alpha$, with summation implied (the generalization to a set of time-dependent, self-adjoint operators $\{\Phi_\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ is briefly discussed later). Taken as the generator of time translations, the extended evolution operator reads

$$\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T [\mathcal{H}(t) + \lambda^\alpha(t)\Phi_\alpha] dt} .$$

If the functions $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ are fixed from the beginning and held fixed, the term $\lambda^\alpha(t)\Phi_\alpha$ provides an addition to the Hamiltonian and modifies the dynamics in the expected way. If we regard the functions $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ as variable external sources, then functional derivatives with respect to them lead to prototype expressions from which time-ordered correlation functions may be obtained. Alternatively, if the functions $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ denote suitable stochastic variables, then an expectation of the given expression may relate to systems interacting with random potentials. Besides these examples, let us consider a rather different interpretation and application of the extra term $\lambda^\alpha(t)\Phi_\alpha$, which we now describe.

Let us accept the hypothesis that the set $\{\Phi_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ consists of *constraint operators*, which, when appropriately satisfied, direct attention to a subspace of $\mathfrak{H}$ called the “physical” Hilbert space and which is denoted by $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$. As a closed subspace, it follows that $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}} = \mathbb{E}\mathfrak{H}$ for some unique projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ ($= \mathbb{E}^\dagger = \mathbb{E}^2$). In turn, the projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ should be given by an acceptable function of the constraint operators $\{\Phi_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^A$, and it is the role

of an integration over the variables $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ to build the necessary projection operator $\mathbb{E}$. Hereafter, we shall refer to the set of functions $\{\lambda^\alpha(t)\}_{\alpha=1}^A$ as the *Lagrange multiplier variables*.

In simple cases it is easy to determine a suitable projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ [1]. For example, if $A = 1$, and so there exists a single constraint, then—see Appendix A—we observe, for any $\delta = \delta(\hbar) > 0$ (N.B. $\delta(\hbar)$ is *not* a Dirac delta function but a rather general function of $\hbar$), that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\lambda\Phi} \frac{\sin(\delta\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda = \mathbb{E}(-\delta \leq \Phi \leq \delta) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) .$$

If $\Phi = 0$ is part of a purely discrete spectrum near zero, then it is possible to choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi = 0)$. When $\Phi = 0$ is part of the continuum, we choose $0 < \delta \ll 1$; one procedure to take the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ to arrive at the true physical Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{true phys}}$ is discussed in Appendix B. From this discussion, it follows in the continuum case that we may regard $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$ as a provisional physical Hilbert space, which, despite the qualifying adjective, is, for an extremely small δ , already acceptable for calculational purposes. As a second example consider that the constraints are the generators of a compact Lie group, and let $dm(\lambda)$ denote the normalized group invariant measure, $\int dm(\lambda) = 1$. In that case (e.g., [1, 2, 3])

$$\int e^{-i\lambda^\alpha\Phi_\alpha} dm(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha = 0, 1 \leq \alpha \leq A) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha \delta^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta = 0) .$$

In order to generate the projection operator $\mathbb{E}$, these examples illustrate that different measures for the Lagrange multiplier variables may be involved. Indeed, in order to construct $\mathbb{E}$, even for a single set of constraints, it is generally the case that the measure for the Lagrange multiplier variables is not unique.

The use of different measures for different situations is not wrong but it does mean that some specific properties about the system, especially the constraints, need to be determined before an expression for $\mathbb{E}$ can be found. This is clearly a nuisance, and it raises the question whether there exists a single, common, integration procedure by which we can construct $\mathbb{E}$, and which, moreover, is a procedure that is *completely independent of the specific constraints at hand*. The answer to this question is “Yes!”, and the aim of the present paper is to develop a *universal prescription for determining* $\mathbb{E}$

from a given set of constraint operators, whatever kind of constraints they may be, by means of a prescription that is also independent of the specific Hamiltonian operator.

There are various kinds of constraints that need to be considered. In the usual nomenclature (see, e.g., [4]), the constraints may be: first class, closed or open; anomalous or second class; primary or secondary; irreducible or reducible; regular or irregular. In the reducible case, where the constraints are linearly dependent, it is possible that there is an infinite degeneracy when $A = \infty$ even if the number of degrees of freedom is finite; see below for an example. Regularity refers to whether the classical constraint is taken (say) as $q = 0$ or as $q^3 = 0$, etc., along with the quantum repercussions of this kind of multiple choice test. Implicitly, we assume that the Hamiltonian and the constraints satisfy some minimal consistency condition, in particular, that the set of constraints already includes all the necessary constraints for a given Hamiltonian..

In what follows, all varieties of constraints will be dealt with in a uniform fashion.

2 Construction of the Physical Space Projection and Evolution Operators

We first observe that the extended evolution operator may be written in the form of a lattice limit given by

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overleftarrow{\prod}_{1 \leq n \leq N} \left[\mathbf{T}e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \right] \left[\mathbf{T}e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha dt} \right],$$

where $\epsilon \equiv T/N$ and the directed product (symbol $\overleftarrow{\prod}$) also respects the time ordering. Thus, this expression is simply an alternating sequence of short-time evolutions, first by $\lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha$, second by $\mathcal{H}(t)$, a pattern which is then repeated $N - 1$ more times. The validity of this Trotter-product form follows whenever $\mathcal{H}(t)^2 + \Phi_\alpha \delta^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta$ is essentially self adjoint for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$. As a slight generalization, we shall assume that $\mathcal{H}(t)^2 + \Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta$ is essentially self adjoint for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$. Here the real, symmetric coefficients $M^{\alpha\beta}$ ($= M^{\beta\alpha}$) are the elements of a positive-definite matrix, i.e., $\{M^{\alpha\beta}\} > 0$. For a finite number of constraints, $A < \infty$, it is sufficient

to assume that $M^{\alpha\beta} = \delta^{\alpha\beta}$; other choices for $M^{\alpha\beta}$ may be relevant when $A = \infty$.

With all this in mind, we shall explain the construction of a formal integration procedure whereby

$$\int \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha dt} \mathcal{D}R(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta(\hbar)^2) ,$$

and for which the integral represented by $\int \cdots \mathcal{D}R(\lambda)$ is independent of the set of operators $\{\Phi_\alpha\}$ and the Hamiltonian operator $\mathcal{H}(t)$ for all t . We will define the left-hand side of this expression by means of an additional lattice limit.

Constructing the basic projection operator

For any given n , $1 \leq n \leq N$, let us divide the time interval $((n-1)\epsilon, n\epsilon]$ into N' , $N' < \infty$, steps of equal duration, $\epsilon' \equiv \epsilon/N' = T/(NN') > 0$. In this way we are led to consider the integrated directed product

$$\int \overleftarrow{\prod}_{1 \leq l \leq N'} e^{-i\epsilon' \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\alpha \Phi_\alpha} dR(\lambda_{r(n,l)})$$

for some measure $dR(\lambda_{r(n,l)})$ to be determined. Observe that in the indicated expression the continuum variable t has been replaced by steps of size ϵ' consecutively numbered by $r(n, l) \equiv (n-1)N' + (l-1)$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$ and $1 \leq l \leq N'$. As far as the previous integral goes, the particular value of n is unimportant and we will suppress it for the rest of this discussion. Thus for the present we replace $r(n, l)$ by l for simplicity. Let us proceed in small steps.

Introduce a measure $dS(\lambda_l)$ for each λ_l and an integral over $\lambda = \{\lambda_l\}_{l=1}^{N'}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} J &\equiv \int \overleftarrow{\prod}_{1 \leq l \leq N'} e^{-i\epsilon' \lambda_l^\alpha \Phi_\alpha} dS(\lambda_l) \\ &= \int \overleftarrow{\prod}_{1 \leq l \leq N'} [\mathbb{1} - i\epsilon' \lambda_l^\alpha \Phi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon'^2 \lambda_l^\alpha \lambda_l^\beta \Phi_\alpha \Phi_\beta + O(\epsilon'^3)] dS(\lambda_l) . \end{aligned}$$

We choose $dS(\lambda_l)$ as a normalized probability measure with the first two correlation functions (moments) given by $\int \lambda_l^\alpha dS(\lambda_l) \equiv 0$ and $\int \lambda_l^\alpha \lambda_l^\beta dS(\lambda_l) \equiv (2\gamma/\epsilon') M^{\alpha\beta}$, $\gamma > 0$, values that are independent of the time-slice label l . With a minimal requirement on higher moments (such as finite fourth-order moments), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \overleftarrow{\prod}_{1 \leq l \leq N'} [\mathbb{1} - \epsilon' \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)] + O(\sqrt{\epsilon'}) \\ &= e^{-N' \epsilon' \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} + O(\sqrt{\epsilon'}) , \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression follows because the factors in the directed product are now identical for every time slice l . At this point we may take the limit $N' \rightarrow \infty$, $\epsilon' \rightarrow 0$ with $N' \epsilon' = \epsilon$ held fixed. Stated formally, the net result is that

$$\int \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha dt} \mathcal{D}S(\lambda) = e^{-\epsilon \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} ,$$

independently of n , $1 \leq n \leq N$. Note that many choices of the basic measure $dS(\lambda_l)$ will lead to the same result. The mechanism which lies behind this conclusion is similar to one leading to the central limit theorem in probability.

The next step in the process is to analytically extend the variable γ , $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma + i\tau$, where $\gamma > 0$ still and $-\infty < \tau < \infty$, namely

$$e^{-\epsilon \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} \rightarrow e^{-\epsilon (\gamma + i\tau) (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} ,$$

and after achieving this extension, the following step is to pass to the limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0^+$. Both of these steps are achieved by the single integral operation

$$\begin{aligned} &\int e^{-\epsilon \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} d\Gamma(\gamma) \\ &\equiv \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{B/2\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2} B \tau^2} \int_0^\infty e^{i B \gamma \tau - \frac{1}{2} B \gamma^2} e^{-\epsilon \gamma (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} d\gamma \\ &= e^{-i \epsilon \tau (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} . \end{aligned}$$

The final step in the construction—see Appendix A—involves an integration over τ given by

$$\int e^{-i \epsilon \tau (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} d\mathbf{T}(\tau)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\equiv \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{-i\epsilon\tau(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} \frac{\sin[\epsilon(\delta^2 + \zeta)\tau]}{\pi\tau} d\tau \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\epsilon \Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \epsilon \delta^2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which achieves our goal. We occasionally symbolize the collective set of operations by $\int \cdots \mathcal{D}R(\lambda)$, leaving the integrals over γ and τ implicit.

To summarize, let us assemble the several, separate operations together. In particular, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta^2) &= \int \mathcal{D}R(\lambda) \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha dt} \\
&\equiv \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L \frac{\sin[\epsilon(\delta^2 + \zeta)\tau]}{\pi\tau} d\tau \\
&\quad \times \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{B/2\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}B\tau^2} \int_0^\infty e^{iB\gamma\tau - \frac{1}{2}B\gamma^2} d\gamma \\
&\quad \times \int \mathcal{D}S(\lambda) \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(n-1)\epsilon}^{n\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha dt},
\end{aligned}$$

where the proper definition of $\int \cdots \mathcal{D}S(\lambda)$ has been given above. In accord with the discussion in Appendix A, we note that if the final limit is replaced by $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^-}$, the result becomes $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta < \delta^2)$.

A few comments are in order. It is noteworthy that $\int \mathcal{D}R(\lambda) = 1$. Thus, in the hypothetical case that all the constraint operators are bogus, i.e., $\Phi_\alpha \equiv 0$ for all α (i.e., not simply *weakly* zero but *strongly* zero), it would follow that

$$\int \mathbb{1} \mathcal{D}R(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}(0 \leq \delta^2) \equiv \mathbb{1}.$$

If some, but not all, of the constraint operators are bogus, then, even though an integration over the associated Lagrange multiplier variables takes place, the answer will be identical to one in which the Lagrange multiplier variables for the bogus constraint operators were ignored from the very beginning. As another hypothetical case, assume that there is an infinite number of identical constraint operators, for example, $\Phi_\alpha \equiv \Phi$ for all α , $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Consequently, the extended evolution operator involves $\mathcal{H}(t) + \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha = \mathcal{H}(t) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^\infty \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi$. We clearly see that there is only one relevant Lagrange multiplier variable, but to act on that knowledge would amount to choosing

an irreducible set of constraints from the original set. Instead, let us keep all the Lagrange multiplier variables as independent quantities and proceed along the lines developed in this paper. In this case let us choose, for example, $M^{\alpha\beta} \equiv (6/\pi^2\alpha^2) \delta^{\alpha\beta}$. Then it follows that the result of the integration with respect to $\mathcal{D}R(\lambda)$ yields the projection operator

$$\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta^2) = \mathbb{E}(\Sigma_{\alpha=1}^\infty (6/\pi^2\alpha^2) \Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) = \mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) ,$$

as desired. This is an (extreme) example of how the present procedure deals with a reducible set of constraints without needing to extract an irreducible subset. For more complicated examples it may be useful to experiment with different choices of $M^{\alpha\beta}$.

The full-time physical evolution operator

Up to this point we have determined how to construct the desired projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ for any (nonzero) short-time interval $\epsilon = T/N$. Let us assume that we have carried out the necessary Lagrange multiplier variable integrations for every time slice, i.e., all n , $1 \leq n \leq N$. The result will be the evolution operator restricted to the physical Hilbert space—let us call it $\mathcal{E}(T)$ —which is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(T) \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(N-1)\epsilon}^{N\epsilon} \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E} e^{-i \int_{(N-2)\epsilon}^{(N-1)\epsilon} \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E} \dots \mathbb{E} e^{-i \int_0^\epsilon \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E} .$$

The indicated limit can be taken with the result that

$$\mathcal{E}(T) = \mathbf{T} \mathbb{E} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt} \mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt}] \mathbb{E} .$$

This result holds whether or not the effective Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_\mathbb{E}(t) \equiv \mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}$ at time t is (essentially) self adjoint or merely symmetric (Hermitian) on $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$. If it is not self adjoint, the resulting evolution will not be unitary. On the other hand, there are many cases of interest when $\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}$ will be self adjoint for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$, and the evolution on the physical Hilbert space will be by unitary operators $\mathcal{E}(T)$ acting on $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$, and which, in fact, act as the zero operator on the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}^\perp = \mathfrak{H} \ominus \mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$, namely, the subspace orthogonal to $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$, which may be called the “unphysical” Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{unphys}} = \mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}^\perp$. This follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E} \mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}^\perp \equiv 0$. For convenience, we will assume that the effective Hamiltonian is self adjoint and

therefore that the resultant evolution is unitary. (Note, even when the effective Hamiltonian is not self adjoint, that fact alone does not imply that the resultant evolution takes physical vectors into unphysical vectors; whatever the form of evolution, vectors that start in the physical Hilbert space will remain in the physical Hilbert space.)

Constructive approach

It is very instructive to see the lattice-limit construction for the evolution operator combined with the constraint operators in as direct a form as possible. For this purpose we assume that $\mathcal{H}(t)$ is a continuous function of t . In that case, and modulo domain considerations, we assert that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt} \mathbb{E}] \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \prod_{1 \leq n \leq N}^{\leftarrow} d\mathbf{T}(\tau_n) d\mathbf{\Gamma}(\gamma_n) \lim_{\epsilon' \rightarrow 0} \int \prod_{1 \leq l \leq N'}^{\leftarrow} dS(\lambda_{r(n,l)}) \\ & \quad \times [\mathbb{1} - i\epsilon' \mathcal{H}_{r(n,l)} - i\epsilon' \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\alpha \Phi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon'^2 \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\alpha \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\beta \Phi_\alpha \Phi_\beta + \dots] . \end{aligned}$$

Here the single index n on the variables τ and γ labels consecutive time steps with a spacing ϵ . Observe that only the *first-order term* (i.e., proportional to ϵ') is necessary to include for the Hamiltonian, but to properly include the constraints it is necessary to include *first- and second-order terms* (i.e., proportional to ϵ' and ϵ'^2). This difference between the dynamics and the constraints holds because the integration over the Lagrange multiplier variables is, in reality, an integral over a (regulated) δ -correlated distribution.

This formula may also be brought to yet another interesting form. By carrying out the integrations over all $\lambda_{r(n,l)}$ and γ_n we are left with the expression

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt} \mathbb{E}] \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \prod_{1 \leq n \leq N}^{\leftarrow} e^{-i\epsilon \mathcal{H}_n - i\epsilon \tau_n (\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)} d\mathbf{T}(\tau_n) , \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}_{r(n,1)}$ and

$$\int (\dots) d\mathbf{T}(\tau_n) \equiv \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L (\dots) \frac{\sin[\epsilon(\delta^2 + \zeta)\tau_n]}{\pi\tau_n} d\tau_n .$$

This expression may be a good place to start calculations in certain circumstances.

Special case

A great deal of simplification takes place whenever $\mathcal{H}(t)\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}\mathcal{H}(t)$ for all t , $0 \leq t \leq T$. In this case we have the identity

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt}] \mathbb{E} = [\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T \mathcal{H}(t) dt}] \mathbb{E} .$$

Observe that the evolution is then automatically unitary in the physical Hilbert space, and that it is only necessary to impose the projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ once, say, as we have done, at the beginning of the evolution, very much in the manner of an initial-value equation used in the case of classical first-class constraints.

Remark

We hasten to add that for a given, specific set of constraints it is generally possible to construct $\mathbb{E}$ by alternative and possibly simpler integral representations. By all means, when simpler procedures exist they should be used. For example, as noted earlier in the case of a set of constraint operators which close to form a Lie algebra for a compact group, a group invariant average over all unitary transformations continuously connected to the identity and generated by the constraint operators leads to the same projection operator $\mathbb{E}$ given by the general prescription developed in this paper for sufficiently small δ , $\delta > 0$.

Relation with Dirac's prescription

The machinery developed above is expressed entirely in an abstract operator form plus a functional integral over the Lagrange multiplier variables which has a well-defined formulation as a lattice limit. Another abstract approach, and one of the more common methods for dealing with constraints in the presence of dynamics, is that proposed by Dirac [5]. Briefly summarized, Dirac's procedure defines the physical Hilbert space as the subspace spanned by vectors $|\psi\rangle_{\text{phys}}$ that fulfill the requirement

$$\Phi_\alpha |\psi\rangle_{\text{phys}} = 0$$

for all α , implying an exact fulfillment of the quantum constraints. For second-class constraints, such as $\Phi_1 = P$ and $\Phi_2 = Q$, where P and Q are conventional Heisenberg variables, there is no nontrivial solution of the equations $P|?\rangle = Q|?\rangle = 0$ for that would require $[Q, P]|?\rangle = i\hbar|?\rangle = 0$. Moreover, for a constraint Φ with zero in its continuous spectrum, the equation $\Phi| \# \rangle = 0$ has no (normalizable) solution in the Hilbert space, i.e., there is no nontrivial solution for $| \# \rangle$. Thus, for second-class constraints, and for general, open first-class constraints, as well as for constraints with zero in the continuum, the basic Dirac prescription is unsatisfactory. Of course, there are modifications of the Dirac scheme, such as the use of a Dirac bracket [5] in the classical theory followed by the adoption of this bracket in the process of canonical quantization. Unfortunately, the classical phase space associated with the Dirac bracket generally has a nontrivial curvature (and possibly a nontrivial topology), and so a straightforward application of the quantization rules generally leads to an incorrect answer.

Nevertheless, there are some elements of the Dirac procedure and the procedure developed in the present paper that are rather close to each other, at least in spirit. For one thing, we note that if $\Phi_\alpha|?\rangle = 0$ for all α , then $(\Phi_\alpha \delta^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta)|?\rangle = 0$ and conversely, where summation is implied and we are only considering the case $M^{\alpha\beta} = \delta^{\alpha\beta}$ for simplicity. For the second-class constraints considered above we would be asking that $(P^2 + Q^2)|?\rangle = 0$, which, as is well known, implies that $|?\rangle \equiv 0$, an unsatisfactory solution. Let us relax this condition (cf., [6]) and say that $(P^2 + Q^2)|?\rangle = \hbar|?\rangle$, for which we do have a nonvanishing solution, namely $|?\rangle = |0\rangle$, the ground state of the harmonic oscillator. There is no violation of the classical limit for these constraints by this modification since, as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$, we recover the original, classical, second-class constraints, namely, $p = 0$ and $q = 0$, in a standard notation. However, the generalization of the Dirac procedure just illustrated suffers from one important defect: The extended criterion does not satisfactorily specify the physical Hilbert space. Take the given example and instead let $(P^2 + Q^2)|?\rangle = c\hbar|?\rangle$ for some constant c . If $c = 3$ there is a solution which is $|?\rangle = |1\rangle$, the first excited state, but for $c = 2$ —or indeed for any c , $1 < c < 3$ —there is *no* nontrivial solution and so $|?\rangle = 0$, even though for any of these cases the recovery of the classical second-class constraints still applies.

Rather than relax the original Dirac prescription in the manner just discussed, we have chosen to look for solutions to the equation $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha \delta^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq$

$\delta^2(\hbar)|\rangle = |\rangle$. It is convenient to examine this expression as a function of δ . For sufficiently large δ , there is generally a nontrivial subspace of vectors satisfying this relation. As δ decreases, the space in question remains the same or its span may decrease. As an example, again take the second-class case and consider $\mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^2 \leq c\hbar)|\rangle = |\rangle$. Beginning with small c , we observe for $c < 1$ that there is no nontrivial solution, $|\rangle = 0$; for $1 \leq c < 3$, there is a single nontrivial solution, $|\rangle = |0\rangle$, which spans a one-dimensional Hilbert space; while for $3 \leq c < 5$, there is a two-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by the two vectors $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, where the latter vector is the first excited state of the harmonic oscillator; etc. This dependence on the parameter c is to be preferred to that described above.

Suppose the second-class constraints are irregular as well. In particular, let $\Phi_1 = P$ and $\Phi_2 = Q^3$. We are then led to consider $\mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^6 \leq c'\hbar^{3/2})$. Let $c' = c'_0$ denote the value that captures the ground state of the ‘‘Hamiltonian’’ $P^2 + Q^6$, let $c' = c'_1$ denote the value that captures the first excited state, etc. The argument then proceeds as above. Of course, $\mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^6 \leq c'\hbar^{3/2}) \neq \mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^2 \leq c\hbar)$, for general c and c' , but this fact merely represents the ever-present $O(\hbar)$ ambiguity in any quantization procedure.

Time-dependent constraints

In the time-dependent case $\Phi_\alpha \rightarrow \Phi_\alpha(t)$, for all α and t , $0 \leq t \leq T$, and assuming each constraint operator is continuous in t as well as the needed self-adjoint properties, we are quickly led to an expression for the evolution operator in the *time-dependent* physical Hilbert space, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}'(T) \\ \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{(N-1)\epsilon}^{N\epsilon} \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E}_{N-1} e^{-i \int_{(N-2)\epsilon}^{(N-1)\epsilon} \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E}_{N-2} \cdots \mathbb{E}_1 e^{-i \int_0^\epsilon \mathcal{H}(t) dt} \mathbb{E}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_n &\equiv \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha(n\epsilon) M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta(n\epsilon) \leq \delta^2) \\ &= \int \mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_{n\epsilon}^{(n+1)\epsilon} \lambda^\alpha(t) \Phi_\alpha(t) dt} \mathcal{D}R(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

While this expression is correct, there does not seem to be any simpler and more elegant operator expression that holds in the general case of time-dependent constraints.

We do not pursue time-dependent constraints further, and hereafter we again assume that all the constraints have no explicit time dependence.

3 Functional Integral Representation

It is convenient to adopt a functional representation for the original Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, and to present the main properties of the foregoing argument in that language. For this purpose, let us focus on a canonical system with $\dim(\mathfrak{H}) = \infty$ and J degrees of freedom, $J < \infty$, described by the basic, irreducible, self-adjoint operators $P = \{P^j\}$ and $Q = \{Q^j\}$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, which satisfy the canonical commutation relations $[Q^j, P^k] = i\delta^{jk}\mathbb{1}$ with all other commutation relations vanishing. As an irreducible set of operators, all other operators may be constructed from the basic ones. Hence, $\mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}(P, Q, t)$ and $\Phi_\alpha = \Phi_\alpha(P, Q)$ for some suitable functions.

Although other bases may be used, we concentrate here on the functional representation induced by coherent states. Thus, along with the canonical operators, we introduce canonical coherent states defined [7] by

$$|p, q\rangle \equiv e^{-iq \cdot P} e^{ip \cdot Q} |\eta\rangle ,$$

where $p = \{p^j\}_{j=1}^J$ and $q = \{q^j\}_{j=1}^J$, with each p^j and q^j an arbitrary real number, $q \cdot P = \sum_{j=1}^J q^j P^j$, etc., and $|\eta\rangle$ is a fixed, normalized fiducial vector. Moreover, for any choice of $|\eta\rangle$ it follows [8] that

$$\int |p, q\rangle \langle p, q| d\mu(p, q) = \mathbb{1} , \quad d\mu(p, q) = \Pi_{j=1}^J dp^j dq^j / 2\pi .$$

Needed domain restrictions on $|\eta\rangle$ will be assumed, without comment, as they arise. At this point p and q , although having suggestive names, are just mathematical labels of the coherent states. As a first step in giving meaning to p and q , we assume that $|\eta\rangle$ is “physically centered”, meaning that $\langle \eta | P | \eta \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \eta | Q | \eta \rangle = 0$. In this case it follows that $\langle p, q | P | p, q \rangle = p$ and $\langle p, q | Q | p, q \rangle = q$. As a second step, we assume that $|\eta\rangle$ is “physically scaled”, i.e., that $\langle \eta | P^2 | \eta \rangle = O(\hbar^a)$ and $\langle \eta | Q^2 | \eta \rangle = O(\hbar^b)$, where $a > 0$, $b > 0$, and $a + b = 2$.

To obtain the desired functional representation for the lattice formulation we repeatedly insert coherent-state resolutions of unity leading to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle p'', q'' | \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{T} e^{-i \int_0^T (\mathbb{E} \mathcal{H}(t) \mathbb{E}) dt} \right] \mathbb{E} | p', q' \rangle \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \prod_{n=1}^N d\mathbf{T}(\tau_n) d\mathbf{\Gamma}(\gamma_n) \left\{ \lim_{\epsilon' \rightarrow 0} \int \prod_{l=1+\delta_{n1}}^{N'} \left[d\mu(p_{r(n,l)}, q_{r(n,l)}) dS(\lambda_{r(n,l)}) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \times \prod_{l=1}^{N'} \left[\langle p_{r(n,l)+1}, q_{r(n,l)+1} | [\mathbb{1} - -i\epsilon' \mathcal{H}_{r(n,l)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - i\epsilon' \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\alpha \Phi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon'^2 \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\alpha \lambda_{r(n,l)}^\beta \Phi_\alpha \Phi_\beta] | p_{r(n,l)}, q_{r(n,l)} \rangle \right] \right\} .
\end{aligned}$$

In this expression we have again used $r(n, l) \equiv (n-1)N' + (l-1)$ and identified $(p'', q'') = (p_{NN'}, q_{NN'})$ and $(p', q') = (p_0, q_0)$. We reemphasize that it is necessary to expand the constraint operators to second order in the lattice spacing in order to correctly obtain the desired projection operator.

It is customary to interchange the order of integration and the continuum limit in order to arrive at a formal expression for the propagator in the presence of the constraints. In so doing one adopts for the integrand the expression it would assume for continuous and differential paths (even if such paths do not contribute in the continuum limit!). In so doing one is led to identify the classical action for which such paths are appropriate. If we proceed in the same fashion, we arrive at the formal functional integral expression

$$\mathcal{M} \int e^{i \int_0^T [p \cdot \dot{q} - H(p, q, t) - \lambda^\alpha(t) \phi_\alpha(p, q)] dt} \mathcal{D}p \mathcal{D}q \mathcal{D}R(\lambda) .$$

In this expression we have introduced the symbols

$$\begin{aligned}
H(p, q, t) &\equiv \langle p, q | \mathcal{H}(P, Q, t) | p, q \rangle , \\
\phi_\alpha(p, q) &\equiv \langle p, q | \Phi_\alpha(P, Q) | p, q \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

We further note that $H(p, q, t) = \mathcal{H}(p, q, t) + O(\hbar^c)$, $c > 0$, and $\phi_\alpha(p, q) = \Phi_\alpha(p, q) + O(\hbar^d)$, $d > 0$, thus leading to the expected behavior as $\hbar \rightarrow 0$.

It is clear from this expression that the system we have quantized here is determined by the ($\hbar$ augmented) classical action functional

$$\int_0^T [p \cdot \dot{q} - H(p, q, t) - \lambda^\alpha(t) \phi_\alpha(p, q)] dt ,$$

which has the expected form of a canonical system in the presence of a number of constraints. Evoking a stationary action principle for this classical action leads to both dynamical and constraint equations as usual. Note that the second-order terms in the constraint operators needed in the lattice formulation to construct the correct quantum projection operator disappear in this formal expression since, for paths and Lagrange multiplier variables that are smooth and differentiable, i.e., have classical behavior, these second-order terms formally disappear.

While the derived classical action essentially reflects the original quantum theory, it is necessary, as always, to exercise great care in elevating a formal path integral involving the classical action to a valid calculational procedure. While not every lattice-limit formulation will lead to the correct answer, we emphasize that one acceptable construction procedure is the one presented in this paper.

Commentary

In a classical theory, such as the one above, it is true that the Lagrange multiplier variables play a significant role in the solution of the classical equations of motion, either being fixed functions chosen to enforce the constraints in the case of second-class constraints, or needing some arbitrary specification (selection of a gauge) when the Lagrange multiplier variables are not determined by the equations of motion in the case of first-class constraints. However, what holds true in the classical theory has no reason to hold true in the completely different quantum theory. For example, it should be noted that nowhere in our discussion have we used the words “gauge” or “gauge fixing” in achieving the proper quantum results. Indeed, in the abstract formulation of Section 2, the concepts of “gauge” and “gauge fixing” are completely foreign to the whole procedure. If anything, “gauge fixing”, and its associated difficulties, is a classical concept inappropriately and unnecessarily carried over into the quantum theory. In concrete terms, and with respect to the formal phase space path integral we have derived, we note that no discussion of gauge invariance of the formal path integral has been given nor is any needed.

If the constraints are all first class and closed, then gauge invariance of the resulting theory as expressed in the (true) physical Hilbert space may be demonstrated [1]. On the one hand, if $\delta > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small

so that $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta^2) \equiv \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta = 0) \neq 0$, then invariance of the resulting theory in the physical Hilbert space follows from the fact that $e^{-i\omega^\alpha \Phi_\alpha} \mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}$ for arbitrary real-valued $\{\omega^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^A$. On the other hand, if $\mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta \leq \delta^2) \neq \mathbb{E}(\Phi_\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\beta = 0)$ no matter how small $\delta > 0$ is, then it means that $e^{-i\omega^\alpha \Phi_\alpha} \mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E} + O(\delta \cdot \mathbb{E})$, and gauge invariance arises in the true physical Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{true phys}}$ only after a suitable $\delta \rightarrow 0$ limit as illustrated in Appendix B. Of course, for second-class constraints the issue of gauge invariance does not arise. The presence of such constraints is distinguished by the fact that $\mathbb{E} \equiv 0$ for all $\delta < \delta'$ for some $\delta' > 0$.

Additionally, we observe that the abstract operator formalism developed in Section 2 applies to a field theory just as well as to general systems of finitely many degrees of freedom, canonical or otherwise. To discuss any system—a model field theory included—one only needs to have candidate operators for the Hamiltonian and for the various constraints expressed in the original Hilbert space.

Acknowledgements

The comments of B.G. Bodmann, J. Govaerts, and S.V. Shabanov are gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix A

The construction of the first projection operator example in Section 1 relies on a conditionally convergent integral, defined for $-\infty < x < \infty$, which is given by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ix\lambda} \frac{\sin(\delta\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda .$$

We may assign one meaning to this expression by choosing the formula

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{-ix\lambda} \frac{\sin(\delta\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda ,$$

an expression which defines the function

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) &= 1 \text{ if } |x| < \delta , \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{ if } |x| = \delta , \\ &= 0 \text{ if } |x| > \delta . \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x)^2 \neq f_{\frac{1}{2}}(x)$, specifically at $|x| = \delta$, which would be needed to ensure that $\mathbb{E}^2 = \mathbb{E}$.

To overcome this difficulty, we adopt the prescription

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &\equiv \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{-ix\lambda} \frac{\sin[(\delta + \zeta)\lambda]}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda \\ &= 1 \text{ if } |x| \leq \delta , \\ &= 0 \text{ if } |x| > \delta . \end{aligned}$$

Clearly in this case $f_1(x)^2 \equiv f_1(x)$ for all x . Likewise we can also define

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x) &= 1 \text{ if } |x| < \delta , \\ &= 0 \text{ if } |x| \geq \delta , \end{aligned}$$

which also satisfies $f_0(x)^2 \equiv f_0(x)$ for all x , by replacing $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+}$ by $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^-}$ in the definition of $f_1(x)$.

In application to a single, self-adjoint quantum constraint Φ , we conclude, for any $\delta > 0$, that

$$\mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) = \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{-i\Phi\lambda} \frac{\sin[(\delta + \zeta)\lambda]}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 < \delta^2) = \lim_{\zeta \rightarrow 0^-} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L e^{-i\Phi\lambda} \frac{\sin[(\delta + \zeta)\lambda]}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda .$$

In many cases the resulting projection operators are identical. An example for which they are not identical is given by

$$|0\rangle\langle 0| \equiv \mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^2 \leq \hbar) \neq \mathbb{E}(P^2 + Q^2 < \hbar) \equiv 0 .$$

Here the one-dimensional projection operator $|0\rangle\langle 0|$ projects onto the ground state for a harmonic oscillator “Hamiltonian” $P^2 + Q^2$.

Unless stated otherwise, we shall adopt the convention that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\Phi\lambda} \frac{\sin(\delta\lambda)}{\pi\lambda} d\lambda \equiv \mathbb{E}(\Phi^2 \leq \delta^2) .$$

Appendix B

The issue of dealing with constraint operators with their zero in the continuous spectrum has been dealt with by several authors [9]. Here we offer a brief discussion in keeping with the style of the present paper.

Let us focus on the projection operator $\mathbb{E}(X^2 \leq \delta^2)$ where $X = 0$ lies in the continuous spectrum of the self-adjoint operator X defined in the original Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$. We write $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{H}_2$ such that, for sufficiently small δ , $X = X_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2$, where X_1 is nondegenerate while $\mathfrak{H}_2$ accounts for possible degeneracy. Generally, this factorization depends on δ , but we assume that a suitable limit of these spaces exists as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In the same decomposition, $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_2$. For product vectors $|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \in \mathfrak{H}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \mathbb{E}(X^2 \leq \delta^2) | \phi \rangle &= \langle \psi_1 | \mathbb{E}_1(X_1^2 \leq \delta^2) | \phi_1 \rangle \langle \psi_2 | \phi_2 \rangle \\ &= \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} d\langle \psi_1 | E_1(x) | \phi_1 \rangle \langle \psi_2 | \phi_2 \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

where $E_1(x)$ is the spectral family for X_1 . For the first factor we choose a functional representation that diagonalizes X_1 leading to

$$\int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_1(x)^* \phi_1(x) dx .$$

For every $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_1\rangle$, this expression vanishes as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. However, before taking the limit let us first rescale this integral so that it reads

$$\frac{1}{2\delta} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_1(x)^* \phi_1(x) dx .$$

This expression has a well-defined and generally nonvanishing limit for a *subset* of elements $\psi_1(x)$ and $\phi_1(x)$, namely, those that are continuous functions in an open set about $x = 0$. For the subset of continuous functions, it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\delta} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_1(x)^* \phi_1(x) dx = \psi_1(0)^* \phi_1(0) .$$

To summarize, we determine, for suitable elements $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_1\rangle$, that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (2\delta)^{-1} \langle \psi | \mathbb{E}(X^2 \leq \delta^2) | \phi \rangle = \psi_1(0)^* \phi_1(0) \langle \psi_2 | \phi_2 \rangle .$$

If this expression is regarded as an incomplete inner product, then, after completion, we learn that the resultant space is $\mathbb{C} \otimes \mathfrak{H}_2 \simeq \mathfrak{H}_2$ since $\mathbb{C}$, the space of complex numbers, has only one (complex) dimension. We conclude that $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{true phys}} = \mathfrak{H}_2$.

We can understand this result in more physical terms. Let us realize $\mathfrak{H}_1$ as $L^2([-\delta, \delta])$ and introduce an orthonormal basis given by $u_n(x) = (1/\sqrt{2\delta}) e^{in\pi x/\delta}$, $n \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$. If the Hamiltonian contained the term $P_x^2 = -\partial^2/\partial x^2$, or such a term was added to the Hamiltonian, then

$$P_x^2 u_n(x) = (n\pi/\delta)^2 u_n(x)$$

since u_n is an eigenfunction of P_x^2 . For very small δ , all energy contributions are huge save for the single case $n = 0$ when this contribution vanishes. Thus, when $\delta \ll 1$ energetics favor only the ground state $u_0(x) = 1/\sqrt{2\delta}$ in an expansion of $\psi_1(x)$ and $\phi_1(x)$, and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\delta} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_1(x)^* \phi_1(x) dx &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{(2\delta)^2} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_1(y)^* dy \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \phi_1(z) dz \\ &= \psi_1(0)^* \phi_1(0) \end{aligned}$$

for functions which are continuous about $x = 0$.

Is it really necessary to take the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$? In our view the practical answer is “No”. For example, if energies are restricted to those which are much less than δ^{-2} , a number which can be chosen as large as one likes, then only the ground-state contribution arises for $\mathfrak{H}_1$ and hence $\mathfrak{H}_{\text{true phys}} = \mathfrak{H}_{\text{phys}}$, as desired.

References

- [1] J.R. Klauder, “Coherent State Quantization of Constraint Systems,” *Ann. Phys.* **254**, 419-453 (1997).
- [2] S.V. Shabanov, “Path Integral in Holomorphic Representation without Gauge Fixation”, in *Path Integrals: Dubna ‘96*, (Publishing Department, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 1996), p. 133-138.
- [3] J. Govaerts and J.R. Klauder, “Solving Gauge Invariant Systems without Gauge Fixing: The Physical Projector in 0+1 Dimensional Theories,” *Ann. Phys.* (in press), hep-th/9809119.
- [4] See, e.g., M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992).
- [5] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, (Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University, New York, 1964).
- [6] D. McMullan and I. Tsutsui, “On the Emergence of Gauge Structures and Generalized Spin when Quantizing on a Coset Space,” *Ann. Phys.* **237**, 269-321 (1995).
- [7] J.R. Klauder and B.-S. Skagerstam, *Coherent States: Applications to Physics and Mathematical Physics*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).
- [8] J. McKenna and J.R. Klauder, “Continuous Representation Theory IV. Structure of a Class of Function Spaces Arising from Quantum Mechanics,” *J. Math. Phys.* **5**, 878-896 (1964).
- [9] See, e.g., H. Grundling and C.A. Hurst, “Algebraic Quantization of Systems with a Gauge Degeneracy,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **98**, 369-390 (1985); A. Higuchi, “Linearized Quantum Gravity in Flat Space with Toroidal Topology,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 2023-2034 (1991); N.P. Landsman, “Rieffel Induction as Generalized Quantum Marsden-Weinstein Reduction,” *J. Geom. Phys.* **15**, 285-319 (1995); J.R. Klauder, “Coherent State Quantization of Constraint Systems,” *Ann. Phys.* **254**, 419-453 (1997).